



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/013,043	10/30/2001	Joubert Berger	10013500-1	7770

7590 11/30/2006
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

NAHAR, QAMRUN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2191

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/013,043	Applicant(s) BERGER ET AL.	
	Examiner Qamrun Nahar	Art Unit 2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09/05/2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the appeal brief filed on 09/05/2006.
2. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franco et al., US Patent No. 6,687,745 (hereinafter Franco) in view of Stoecker et al, US Patent No. 5,850,511 (hereinafter Stoecker) to claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-19 and 21-24 is withdrawn in view of applicant's remarks/arguments.
3. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franco in view of Stoecker, and further in view of Bearden et al. US Patent No. 6,550,061 (hereinafter Bearden) to claims 4-5, 20 and 25 is withdrawn in view of applicant's remarks/arguments.
4. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franco in view of Stoecker, and further in view of Andersen et al. US Patent No. 6,795,963 (hereinafter Andersen) to claim 8 is withdrawn in view of applicant's remarks/arguments.
5. Claims 1-25 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-19 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franco et al., US Patent No. 6,687,745 (hereinafter Franco) in view of McNabb et al. (U.S. 6,289,462) (hereinafter McNabb).

As Per Claim 1, Franco teaches “enabling selection of an application from one or more applications (e.g. see col. 4:18-24, which states “... selectively retrieving and presenting remotely stored applications ... “); “enabling dragging of a graphical representation of said selected application towards a graphical representation of the recipient computer (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, dragged and dropped); “enabling dropping of said graphical representation of said application on said graphical representation of said recipient computer (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, droplet-enabled)”; and “automatically installing said selected application in said recipient computer in response to said dropping of said graphical representation of said selected application (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, which states “... attachment is copied onto ...”)”.

Franco does not explicitly teach a compartment of said trusted operating system. McNabb teaches a compartment of said trusted operating system (e.g. see “partition” in column 17, lines 49-57).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Franco to include a compartment of said trusted operating system using the teaching of McNabb. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to provide the level of assurance needed to support critical network and transaction servers (McNabb, column 17, lines 49-52).

As Per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Franco teaches: “automatically determining one or more supporting resources (e.g. see col. 20:9-14, droplet-

Art Unit: 2191

enabled survey application and/or information) associated with said selected application”;
“automatically retrieving said supporting resources (e.g. see col. 20:14, retrieved)”; and
“automatically installing said supporting resources within said recipient computer (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14)”; and McNabb teaches said compartment (e.g. see “partition” in column 17, lines 49-57).

As Per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Franco teaches:
“automatically determining access controls for one or more files associated with said selected application (e.g. see col. 16:53-66, which states “The file generated during the downloading operation is accessed to support the representation operation ...”)”; and “automatically setting said determined access controls for said one or more files (e.g. see col. 16:53-66, which states “...the details/content of the file are determined by the parameters that embedded the downloadable item (link) into the informational content 36 delivered to the client computer 20 ...”)”.

As Per claim 6, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further Franco teaches
“automatically selecting one or more library files (e.g. see col. 18:23-28)”.

As Per claim 7, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further Franco teaches
“automatically selecting one or more configuration files (e.g. see FIG. 1, file 74 and associated text, and col. 4:46-47, network configured computer processing system)”.

As Per claim 9, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Franco teaches “automatically determining access controls for at least one of said files based at least in part on the type of the file (e.g. see col. 20:3)”.

As Per claim 10, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further Franco teaches “automatically determining access controls for at least one of said files based at least in part on the location of the file (e.g. see FIG. 1, link 72 and associated text)”.

As Per claim 11, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Franco teaches “enabling dropping of said graphical representation of said application in close proximity to said graphical representation of said recipient computer (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14)”; and McNabb teaches said compartment (e.g. see “partition” in column 17, lines 49-57).

As Per claim 12, this claim is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1; and Franco further teaches “displaying a graphical representation of a plurality of recipient computers” (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14); and McNabb further teaches plurality of compartments of said trusted operating system (e.g. see “partition” in column 17, lines 49-57).

As per Claims 13-14, the rejection of claim 12 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 2-3 respectfully.

As Per claim 15, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated and further McNabb teaches assigning a compartment label unique to said compartment to each of said supporting resources (column 17, lines 49-57).

As per Claim 16, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 11.

As Per claim 17, this claim is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 12.

As per Claims 18-19, the rejection of claim 17 are incorporated and are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 16 and 14 respectfully.

As per Claim 21, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claims 9-10.

As Per claims 22-23, these claims are rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1.

As Per claim 24, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Franco teaches “enabling dropping of said graphical representation of said selected application in close

Art Unit: 2191

proximity to said graphical representation of said selected compartment (e.g. see col. 19:64 to col. 20:14, droplet-enabled)”.

8. Claims 4-5, 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franco in view of McNabb, and further in view of Bearden et al. US Patent No. 6,550,061 (hereinafter Bearden).

As Per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further the combination of Franco and McNabb does not explicitly teach displaying file access control. However, Bearden in an analogous art teaches in a manner such as “displaying said access controls along with the files with which said access controls are associated”. (E.g. see FIGURE 6. and associated text, i.e. see col. 5:19-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Bearden into the teaching of the combination of Franco and McNabb to display file access control. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated for a user to delete registry keys by adding a user with administrators privileges.

As Per claim 5, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and further the combination of Franco and McNabb does not explicitly disclose modifying access controls in response to a user input. However, Bearden in an analogous art teaches in a manner such as “modifying said access controls in response to a user input”. (E.g. see FIGURE 6. and associated text, i.e. see col. 5:19-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Bearden into the

Art Unit: 2191

teaching of the combination of Franco and McNabb to modify access controls in response to a user input. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated for a user to delete registry keys by adding a user with administrators privileges.

As per Claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated and is rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 4.

As Per claim 25, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and further Franco teaches “automatically determining access controls for one or more files associated with said selected application (e.g. see col. 16:53-66, which states “The file generated during the downloading operation is accessed to support the representation operation ...”); and “automatically setting said determined access controls for said one or more files (e.g. see col. 16:53-66, which states “...the details/content of the file are determined by the parameters that embedded the downloadable item (link) into the informational content 36 delivered to the client computer 20 ...”)”.

The combination of Franco and McNabb does not explicitly disclose displaying file access control. However, Bearden in an analogous art teaches in a manner such as “displaying said access controls along with the files with which said access controls are associated”. (E.g. see FIGURE 6. and associated text, i.e. see col. 5:19-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Bearden into the teaching of the combination of Franco and McNabb to display file access control. The modification would have been obvious because one of

Art Unit: 2191

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated for a user to delete registry keys by adding a user with administrators privileges.

The combination of Franco and McNabb does not explicitly teach modifying access controls in response to a user input. However, Bearden in an analogous art teaches in a manner such as “modifying said access controls in response to a user input”. (E.g. see FIGURE 6. and associated text, i.e. see col. 5:19-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Bearden into the teaching of the combination of Franco and McNabb to modify access controls in response to a user input. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated for a user to delete registry keys by adding a user with administrators privileges.

9. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Franco in view of McNabb, and further in view of Andersen et al. US Patent No. 6,795,963 (hereinafter Andersen).

As Per claim 8, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and further the combination of Franco and McNabb does not explicitly teach querying an executable file. However, Andersen in an analogous art teaches in a manner such as “querying an executable file (E.g. see col. 11:21-25)”. Therefore, it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Andersen into the teaching of the combination of Franco and McNabb to query an executable file. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated for a debugger to enhance analysis of core files in an interactive debugging environment.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Conclusion


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Qamrun Nahar whose telephone number is (571) 272-3730. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Y Zhen, can be reached on (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or processing is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Qamrun Nahar
November 25, 2006


Primary Examiner
11.27.2006